

University of Groningen

Secular Practices

Wiering, Jelle Oscar

DOI:
[10.33612/diss.135296628](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.135296628)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2020

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Wiering, J. O. (2020). *Secular Practices: The Production of Religious Difference in the Dutch field of Sexual Health*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen.
<https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.135296628>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Secular Practices

The Production of Religious Difference in the Dutch field of Sexual Health

By
Jelle Oscar Wiering

Colofon

The Production of Religious Difference in the Dutch field of Sexual Health© Jelle Oscar Wiering, 2020

Cover design: Renée de Lau

Layout: Publiss | www.publiss.nl

Printed by: Ridderprint | www.ridderprint.nl

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means without prior written permission from the author.



rijksuniversiteit
 groningen

Secular Practices

The Production of Religious Difference in the Dutch field of
Sexual Health

PhD thesis

to obtain the degree of PhD at the
University of Groningen on
the authority of the
Rector Magnificus Prof. C. Wijmenga
and in accordance with
the decision by the College of Deans.

This thesis will be defended in public on
Tuesday 8 September 2020 at 11.00 hours

By

Jelle Oscar Wiering

born on 11 June 1990

in Amsterdam

Supervisors

Dr. K.E. Knibbe

Prof. C.K.M von Stuckrad

Co-supervisor:

Dr. C. Hirschkind

Assessment committee:

Prof. P.E. Klassen

Prof. M. Scheer

Prof. T.H. Weir

The work conducted for this book was funded by the Dutch NWO, project number 360-25-160.

To critique a particular normative regime is not to reject or condemn it; rather, by analyzing its regulatory and productive dimensions, one only deprives it of innocence and neutrality so as to craft, perhaps, a different future.

Saba Mahmood (2016: 21)

The question I would like to pose is not, Why are we repressed? but rather, Why do we say, with so much passion and so much resentment against our most recent past, against our present, and against ourselves, that we are repressed? By what spiral did we come to affirm that sex is negated?

Michel Foucault (1990: 8-9)

Table of contents

List of Figures	8
Acknowledgements	13
Introduction	19
Chapter 1: A Material Approach to the Secular	33
Introduction	34
1.1 On Interpreting Secularity	34
1.2 Secular Materiality	39
1.3 Sexuality, Gender, and the Secular	41
Chapter 2: The Dutch Field of Sexual Health	47
Introduction	48
2.1 Key Actors in the Field	49
2.1.1 The Community Health Service	49
2.1.2 Sexual Health Consultants	52
2.1.3 Rutgers	54
2.2 Sexual Health Organizations and Religion	64
2.3 Understandings of Christianity	67
2.4 Understandings of Islam	69
Chapter 3: Gender in the Dutch field of Sexual Health	75
Introduction	76
3.1 Improving Dutch Sexual Wellbeing	76
3.2 The Social/Natural Body Distinction	80
3.3 Developing Protocols versus Disciplining Oneself	87
3.4 Sex: A Women's Topic?	91
3.5 Gender and Sexuality in the Netherlands	94
3.6 Sex Education, Gender, and Secularity	97

Chapter 4: Fishing and Bluffing: Conducting Participant Observation as a Sex Educator **101**

Introduction	102
4.1 Academic Discussions about Comprehensive Sex Education	103
4.2 On Embodiment	106
4.3 Conducting Participant Observation as a Sex educator	108
4.4 My Training at Tanos	109
4.5 My Sex Education Classes	111
4.6 Being A Sex educator	113
4.6.1 Bluffing	114
4.6.2 Fishing	118
4.7 What Constitutes a Good Sex Educator?	124
4.8 Discussions about Sex Education: A Sex Educator's Perspective	126

Chapter 5: The Normalization of Sex **131**

Introduction	132
5.1 Dokter Corrie	134
5.1.1 The Protestors' Problems with Dokter Corrie	137
5.1.2 Dokter Corrie and Speaking about Sexuality	139
5.2 Hotel Sophie	142
5.2.1 First Fragment	143
5.2.2 Second Fragment	144
5.2.3 Third Fragment	147
5.3 Speaking about Sex and the Nativist Triangle	154

Chapter 6: The Case of Tanos: The Production of Religious Difference in the Netherlands **161**

Introduction	162
6.1 Meeting Tanos	163
6.2 Tanos and Abortion	165
6.3 Tanos and Its Approach to Sexuality	168
6.4 The (Christian) Identity of Tanos	174
6.5 Representations of Tanos in Public Discourse	181
6.6 (Financial) Outcomes of the Controversy	184
6.7 Fearsome Stereotypes	187
6.8 Secular Sensibilities	194

Chapter 7: The Battle for Sex	197
7.1 Notions of Sex in the Dutch Field of Sexual Health	199
7.2 The Field's Undergirding Frameworks	204
7.2.1 The Medical Framework	204
7.2.2 The Emancipatory Framework	206
7.2.3 The Nationalist Framework	207
7.3 Trajectories of the Secular	209
7.3.1 The Natural Body	209
7.3.2 Morality	212
7.3.3 The Privatization of Religion	212
Conclusion: The Power of Secular Practices	216
Dutch Summary	222
References	228

List of Figures

Figure 1.

Screenshot by H. Roosjen (2019). “Welcome to Sense” © Soa Aids. Retrieved December 13, 2019, from www.sense.info.nl. **51**

Figure 2.

Screenshot by author. Rutgers (2018) “Lang Leve de Liefde [‘long live love’] © 2017 Facebook. Retrieved April 10, 2018, from <https://www.facebook.com/NL.Rutgers/>. **56**

Figure 3.

Screenshot by author. Rutgers (2018). “Yess mooie actie!” © Facebook. Retrieved April 23, 2018, from: <https://www.facebook.com/NL.Rutgers>) **57**

Figure 4.

Screenshot by author. Rutgers (2018). “Abortion pill available at the general practitioner.” ©Facebook. Retrieved February 21, 2018, from: <https://www.facebook.com/NL.Rutgers>. **58**

Figure 5.

Screenshot by author. Rutgers (2016:59): “List financial donors”, Annual report. **59**

Figure 6.

Screenshot by author. Rutgers (2016:50): “Government grants”, Annual report. **60**

Figure 7.

Screenshot by author. Rutgers (2016:50): “Government grants”, Annual report. **61**

Figure 8.

Screenshot by author. Rutgers (2016:38). “Expenditure”, Annual report. **61**

Figure 9.

“Model of a clitoris”, Wikipedia (2018). Retrieved May 16, 2018, from: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Repr%C3%A9sentation_%C3%A0_taille_r%C3%A9elle_d%27un_organisme_bulbo-clitoridien_01.jpg. **84**

Figure 10.

“Is the clitoris a failed penis?” Presentation Ellen Laan. © Ellen Laan. Picture taken by author. **85**

Figure 11.

“Orgasm consistency”. Presentation Ellen Laan. © Ellen Laan. Picture taken by author. **85**

Figure 12.

Screenshot by author: Bonjour & Van der Vlugt (2018). “Competencies of sex educators.”. **124**

Figure 13.

““Ongewenst zwanger? Chat nu!”” Rottinghuis (2018). © Milo Rottinghuis. retrieved March 13, 2019, from <https://www.groene.nl/artikel/ongewenst-zwanger-chat-nu>. **191**

Acknowledgements

Scholars in academia are encouraged to collaborate with colleagues to develop (interdisciplinary) networks, and to organize social activities such as joining close reading groups, or having drinks after a congress. However, at the same time, these scholars, and particularly job-seeking scholars, are evaluated primarily on the basis of their individual research output. This paradoxically implies that, though research is often produced through various forms of collaboration, its assessment occurs on a level much more focused on the individual. Therefore, I am happy that I can begin this book by naming and thanking the many wonderful people who not only taught me what to write, but also how to write it.

First, I want to thank all the people who helped me to begin this project. Many of them have become friends. Only a month after I had begun working on the project, I joined Mariecke van den Berg, Nella van den Brandt, and Matthea Westerduin in attending a congress in Tübingen on the secular body. Looking at this event in hindsight, I can see that it has been of major importance for the study. Not just in terms of the congress' content, but also because many of the speakers present there subsequently visited the Netherlands and engaged with my project.

Mariecke, Nella, and Matthea also introduced me to the Noster 'Challenge of Difference' text reading group, then led by Anne-Marie Korte. This seminar introduced me to gender and sexuality studies, but it also taught me a lot about intersectional and post-secularist approaches. Anne-Marie Korte, Sarah Bracke, Rahil Roodsaz, Lieke Schrijvers, Mariecke van den Berg, Nella van den Brandt, Daan Oostveen, Matthea Westerdijk, Amal Miri, Erik Meinema, Maria Vlieg, Megan Milota, Kathrine van den Bogert, Eline Huygens, An van Raemsdonk, and Marco Derksen: I enjoyed and benefited considerably from the many sessions we shared. I can of course only mention a few features here but I do want to highlight my appreciation for Mariecke's terrific humor and our shared taste for good food, Nella's love for special beers, the publication, travels and sex talks I shared with Lieke, and, finally, Anne-Marie's sincere interest in my research during the drinks in Café Hofman after our meetings. I have learned so much from all of you, thank you.

In Autumn 2016, I signed up for a course on ethnographic research, taught by Annemarie Mol at the UvA. Her provocative stance towards basically any dogma in academia has inspired me, and I want to thank her for that. Also many thanks to Oskar Verkaaik and Marian Burchardt, who provided wonderful feedback on my first theoretical considerations, and to Willemijn Krebbekx who gave helpful comments about chapter 3.

I also want to thank Adriaan van Klinken and Emma Tomalin for their collaboration in Leeds during the summer in 2017. Also thanks to my wonderful colleagues at the CRCG: Erin Wilson, Joram Tarusarira, Julia Martinez-Ariño, Roos Feringa, and Méadhbh McIvor, as well as the members of our Habermas reading club: Sjoerd Griffioen and Sanne Hupkes. In addition, 2017 was the year in which Nella and I organized the successful ‘Does the secular matter?’ seminar, funded by Noster, Utrecht University, and the University of Groningen. I want to thank Matthew Engelke, Pamela Klassen, Birgit Meyer, Monique Scheer, and the many participants for making this event such a success. It has had a profound influence on the theoretical framework of this thesis. I am also very grateful for the feedback provided by Nadia Fadil and Jelle Creemers during the EASR in Leuven. My thanks also to the members of the ‘Religion, body, media and heritage’ seminar from whom I have learned a lot. I want to thank Irene in particular here.

I want to thank the many people who played a role in my fieldwork, though I cannot call them by name due to anonymity concerns. I do want to name Edith, Marieke, Roos, and Nafisa. I also want to thank the wonderful people working for Rutgers, Tanos, the Community Health Service, and many, many more: I am very grateful for your willingness to participate in my research. I also want to thank Rachel and Niki for extending their participation even further and participating, together with Marijke Naezer whom I also want to thank, in our panel during the ‘(En)gendering new conversations in the anthropology of gender and sexuality’ workshop in Groningen.

In 2019, I organized the Noster seminar ‘Talking and Walking; Exploring Intersections of Embodiment and Agency in Religious-secular Formations’, and I want to thank Anna Fedele, Schirin Amir Moazami, Birgitte Schepelern Johansen, and Kholoud Al Ajarma for their participation and wonderful contributions. It was a joyful experience to

organize this seminar and this was mainly due to the fantastic group of participants. I am also very grateful for Birgit Meyer's aid throughout my PhD project; Birgit, it is so nice to know you well and to collaborate with you. Then I, of course, also want to express my gratitude towards the reading committee: Pamela Klassen, Monique Scheer, and Todd Weir.

Also my thanks to my wonderful colleagues in Groningen. Kees 'Jokeren' van den Ende, Brenda 'hardlopen' Mathijssen, Henk 'Schorpioen' van Putten, Thea 'IJsland' de Boer, and all the others: you have always made me feel really at home at the faculty. Welmoed, Harry, Els, and Fardo, you have been wonderful roomies, and I much enjoyed the many laughs and irrelevant chats that we had. Lucy, thank you for your wonderful editing, it has made this book so much better. Christoph, I also want to thank you from the bottom of my heart. There are simply too many things to list here, so I will just thank you for being Saruman.

Having thanked all these wonderful people, it is now time to turn to the people who have been engaged with my project from the start till its very end. I first want to thank my Amsterdam colleagues: Amisah Bakuri, Rachel Spronk, and Rijk van Dijk. I learned a lot from you and it has been a pleasure to collaborate and have fun with you. Amisah, I will not forget our nice trip to Leeds and the many unnecessary kilometers that we walked there.

I also want to thank my supervisor Kocku von Stuckrad and my co-supervisor Charles Hirschkind. Kocku, thank you for your assistance throughout the project. Charles, I can only imagine how strange it must have been to suddenly be approached by a totally unfamiliar tall Dutch guy in shorts – who was sweating profusely after a 1,5-hour bike tour in 40 degrees Celsius New Orleans – only to be asked to become his co-promotor. I have learned so much from you and I am very happy that you were willing to supervise me. I also want to thank you for your support and company during my visit to Berkeley, and I hope I will continue to have the privilege to work together with you. I also want to thank Brenda Bartelink, who has been both a friend and a 'kind of' supervisor throughout my project. We have conducted a variety of activities, and had a lot of fun, together. I am really grateful for that. I hope we will keep on working together in the future.

Then there's my family and friends who have always been there to put me back on my feet when needed. My friends from my football team who are always willing to help me with getting rid of these annoying sharp edges. My sister and my colleagues Luuk and Vincent, who regularly join(ed) me on the Uithof. And the many other friends and family members who are always happy to listen to, and engage with, stories about my fieldwork. Monique, Eric, and Marjolein, thank you for your engagement and interest. I also want to thank my parents Anjo and Olga, my stepfather Frans, my sister Josse and her boyfriend Felix, for supporting me during throughout these four years.

I could not have finished this PhD journey without the help of Marjola and Jeroen. This PhD has not only taught me a lot, it has also given me two extra family members for which I am very, very grateful. Marjola and Jeroen: I want to thank you for everything that you have done. I am afraid there are no words to express how grateful I am.

I also want to thank my supervisor Kim Knibbe. I've heard so many stories about horrible supervisors, but my own experience has been a totally different one. Many colleagues are happy that their PhD project has ended, but I would have loved to continue working on mine for many more years. I enjoyed each and every moment of my PhD and I know one important reason for this is Kim's wonderful supervision. Kim, your knowledge, creativity, friendliness, trust, and genuine interest in the project, have been a source of constant motivation, and I could not have wished for a better supervisor. Thank you for everything.

Finally, I want to thank my wife Eveline, who has been my companion ever since I left home.

